

Beck, J. R.

Prof. Duglison  
with the respects  
of Dr. Beck

---

J. R. BECK  
ON THE  
STATISTICS  
OF THE  
DEAF AND DUMB.

---

Surgeon General's Office  
Library  
29274  
Washington, D.C.

1840  
1841  
1842



**ART. XII. STATISTICS of the DEAF AND DUMB in the STATE OF NEW-YORK, the UNITED STATES, and in various Countries of EUROPE, by T. ROMEYN BECK, M. D.**

[FROM THE TRANSACTIONS OF THE NEW-YORK STATE MEDICAL SOCIETY.]

I have supposed that there might be some utility in collecting and arranging the Statistics of the DEAF AND DUMB in a compact and accessible form. The subject is of interest, particularly as it regards their education. Besides this, it is also curious to note the difference in the number of cases that occur in various countries. Any inference as to the causes of this infirmity, and its greater or less prevalence, must of course be based on the facts which have been elicited by accurate enumerations.

Two periods have now elapsed (1825 and 1835,) during which enumerations have been taken in the State of New-York. Intermediate between these, there has been one made in 1830, under the direction of the United States Government. The details of each are to be found only in the official publications that have been issued by the respective authorities, and as these are voluminous and not generally accessible, and their results have not been compared with the existing population, probably the information now given may be new to many of the readers of this communication.

I have subjoined such statistical details as I have been enabled to collect, concerning different European countries.

**STATE OF NEW-YORK.**

By the provisions of the law of this State, requiring an enumeration of its inhabitants to be taken every ten years, commencing with 1825, every marshal is directed to report the number of male and female Deaf and Dumb within his town or ward, under ten years of age—between ten and twenty-five years of age, and as to circumstances, whether they are supported by charity or are of sufficient ability to

support themselves. Finally, he is to report the total number.

*The following is a tabular view of the two enumerations.*

Counties.	1825.				Total	1835.				Total.	
	Males.		Females.			Males.		Females.			Over 25. of either sex.
	Under 10.	Between 10 & 25.	Under 10.	Between 10 & 25.		Under 10.	Between 10 & 25.	Under 10.	Between 10 & 25.		
Albany, .....	3	14	1	5	24	1	4	3	9	10	*29
Allegany, .....	..	3	..	2	8	2	2	3	4	10	*22
Broome, .....	..	2	..	2	5	1	4	1	2	3	1
Cattaraugus, .....	3	2	..	2	7	1	7	..	2	9	19
Cayuga, .....	4	6	5	8	25	3	2	4	3	8	20
Chatauque, .....	..	2	1	4	8	1	2	1	7	4	15
Chenango, .....	3	1	1	..	6	3	2	..	5	6	16
Clinton, .....	2	4	..	6	12	..	4	1	4	8	17
Columbia, .....	3	6	1	1	12	1	2	1	4	9	17
Cortland, .....	..	2	..	..	4	1	3	1	3	4	12
Delaware, .....	1	3	1	2	11	..	4	1	7	7	19
Dutchess, .....	..	1	2	4	8	5	..	2	4	5	16
Erie, .....	1	1	2	2	9	..	2	1	3	5	11
Essex, .....	..	..	..	2	4	1	..	3	..	3	7
Franklin, .....	3	1	..	1	5	2	1	1	4	..	8
Genesee, .....	3	4	2	7	17	7	4	1	4	6	22
Greene, .....	3	2	5	4	15	1	..	..	3	6	10
Herkimer, .....	1	1	1	5	12	1	1	1	4	7	14
Jefferson, .....	4	6	1	5	18	3	6	3	9	12	33
Kings, .....	..	..	..	..	..	2	1	2	1	2	8
Lewis, .....	..	2	..	3	5	1	..	..	1	3	5
Livingston, .....	1	1	..	4	6	..	2	1	3	3	9
Madison, .....	..	5	..	3	12	1	5	..	..	9	15
Monroe, .....	..	2	1	5	8	6	4	4	6	4	24
Montgomery, ..	..	24	10	20	55	5	7	3	12	20	*47
New-York, .....	1	31	..	24	56	6	61	4	86	20	177
Niagara, .....	..	2	..	3	5	1	2	..	..	4	7
Oneida, .....	4	5	1	9	19	6	5	2	11	9	33
Onondaga, .....	..	4	1	8	14	2	6	3	5	5	21
Ontario, .....	1	4	3	4	15	..	3	1	2	2	8
Orange, .....	2	2	2	4	17	5	5	2	3	11	26
Orleans, .....	1	5	..	2	8	2	..	1	1	5	9
Oswego, .....	..	..	..	1	1	6	1	1	4	8	20
Otsego, .....	2	12	4	7	26	5	6	4	4	11	30
Putnam, .....	..	..	..	1	1	1	1	..	..	4	6
Queens, .....	..	5	..	2	9	3	2	2	2	6	15
Rensselaer, ....	1	3	2	4	13	1	4	1	4	9	*22
Richmond, .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Rockland, .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	4	5
Saratoga, .....	1	7	1	2	14	..	3	2	2	5	12
Schenectady, ..	1	1	..	1	4	2	3	1	4	7	17
Schoharie, .....	2	6	3	3	13	1	2	..	4	4	11
Seneca, .....	..	2	..	1	4	1	1	..	1	2	5
St. Lawrence, ..	2	5	1	2	10	1	5	3	4	3	*17
Steuben, .....	..	..	5	5	14	4	3	2	6	5	20
Suffolk, .....	1	3	..	3	7	2	7	..	1	8	18
Sullivan, .....	..	..	1	..	1	..	..	..	..	2	2
Tioga, .....	1	1	..	..	2	1	4	1	..	2	..



Tompkins, .....	..	7	3	7	17	1	5	3	3	4	16
Ulster, .....	5	4	1	9	19	1	7	2	6	9	25
Warren, .....	1	1	2	...	4	1	1	1	3	1	7
Washington, ....	3	10	1	9	25	1	4	..	7	8	20
Wayne, .....	2	2	1	5	23	2	7	4	7	21	41
Westchester, ....	..	3	..	....	4	2	3	2	....	....	7
Yates, .....	1	....	1	....	2	1	2	2	3	1	9
	68	220	67	213	644	108	222	83	277	343	1033

# REMARKS.

*Census of 1825—Erie County.*—In the official account of this census (Recapitulation Table) the numbers between 10 and 25 in Erie county is stated to be two, but by referring to the county return, it will be found to be one. Hence the result of this column requires alteration from 221 to 220.

*Ontario County.*—In the recapitulation table, the total in this county is put 16. It should be 15.

In consequence of these alterations, the grand total is 644, and not 645, as stated in the printed census and copied in an article published in the New-York Medical and Physical Journal, vol. 5, p. 206.

*Census of 1835.*—There are several important errors in the official tables.

*Albany County.*—In the recapitulation table, the total of this county is carried out as 27, but it should be 29, as *four* are enumerated in the second ward of the city of Albany, and but *two* carried out in the total column.

*Allegany County* has in the same table 21 credited to it. It should be 22, since there is one in the town of Ossian, whose age is not given, but who is enumerated in the non-charity list.

*Rensselaer County* is put down in the same table total 19. It should be 22, as three in the first ward of Troy are not counted here. The county return is accurate.

*St. Lawrence County*, in the table, is put total 16, but one enumerated in the town of Brasher in the columns of charity, but not in those of age, should be added.

The census of the Central Asylum at Canajoharie, appended to that of Montgomery county, is not included in the general recapitulation table. It is as follows :

Males, under 10,	1	Females, under 10,	1
between 10 & 25, 11		between 10 & 25, 16	
—		over 25 years,	1
12		—	
		18	

There is a further misprint in the grand total in the official recapitulation table. It is 933 and should be 1033. If, then, we add to this last, the *seven* above noticed, where ages are not stated, Albany 2, Allegany 1, Rensselaer 3 and St. Lawrence 1 ; and also the census of the Central Asylum at Canajoharie, the total will be 1070.

After these corrections, and which it may be proper to state I have taken great pains to verify, the results of these tables will stand as follows :

	1825.	1835.*
<i>Males</i> , under 10 years,	68	109
between 10 and 25,	220	233
<i>Females</i> , under 10 years,	67	84
between 10 and 25,	213	293
Number above 25,	76	344
Age not stated,	00	7
	<hr/> 644	<hr/> 1070

Year.	No. of Deaf & Dumb.	Population.	Proportion
1825.	644	1,616,458	1 in 2510
1830.†	885	1,918,608	1 in 2167
1835.	1070	2,174,517	1 in 2032

I may add that the State Asylums for the deaf and dumb are respectively at New-York and Canajoharie.

\* The census of the Canajoharie Asylum is added under each appropriate head. † United States census. See the next table.



The following additional results are obtained from the official tables :

	1825.	1835.
Supported by charity,	141	278
Of sufficient ability to support themselves,	387	541
	<hr/> 528	<hr/> 819

UNITED STATES.

The marshals of the respective districts were required by the Department of State to make the following inquiries :

1. What number of white persons were there who were deaf and dumb under fourteen years of age—deaf and dumb of fourteen and under twenty-five, and deaf and dumb of twenty-five and upwards?
2. The same inquiries as to slaves and colored persons.

The results of this census are given in the following table.

*Deaf and Dumb in the United States, according to the  
Census of 1830.*

States and Territories.	Whites.				Slaves and colored persons.				Grand Total.
	Under 14.	Between 14 & 25.	25 and upwards.	Total.	Under 14.	Between 14 & 25.	25 and upwards.	Total.	
Maine, .....	64	60	56	180	4	..	1	5	185
New Hampshire, .....	32	55	48	135	5	1	3	9	144
Massachusetts, .....	56	62	138	256	2	3	4	9	265
Rhode Island, .....	6	22	28	56	2	2	..	4	60
*Connecticut, .....	43	152	99	294	4	2	..	6	300
Vermont, .....	39	59	55	153	3	..	2	5	158
New-York, .....	277	310	255	842	17	14	12	43	885
New Jersey, .....	64	71	72	207	5	2	8	15	222
Pennsylvania, .....	224	279	255	758	12	12	15	39	797
Delaware, .....	6	15	14	35	..	5	4	9	44
Maryland, .....	50	31	54	135	40	30	26	96	231
Virginia, .....	132	118	169	419	51	41	38	130	549
North Carolina, .....	70	81	79	230	31	27	25	83	313
South Carolina, .....	60	52	62	174	9	27	33	69	243
Georgia, .....	50	51	44	145	26	21	12	59	204
Alabama, .....	45	25	19	89	9	7	7	23	112
Mississippi, .....	12	10	7	29	2	8	2	12	41
Louisiana, .....	15	15	19	49	7	5	9	21	70
Tennessee, .....	59	59	54	172	13	9	6	28	200
Kentucky, .....	100	113	90	303	16	25	5	46	349
Ohio, .....	148	160	118	426	5	..	4	9	435
Indiana, .....	49	59	33	141	1	2	..	3	144
Illinois, .....	23	27	16	66	..	..	..	..	66
Missouri, .....	12	5	10	27	2	1	5	8	35
Michigan, .....	4	7	4	15	..	..	..	..	15
Arkansas, .....	6	2	2	10	4	..	..	4	14
Florida, .....	2	..	3	5	1	2	3	6	11
District of Columbia, .....	4	5	3	12	2	..	..	2	14
	1652	1905	1806	5363	273	246	224	743	6106

The population of the United States, as ascertained by the census amounts to..... 12,860,702

Add census of the navy of U. S.,..... 5,318

Total population, ..... 12,866,020

Proportion, .... 1 in 2,107

\*126 in West Hartford.



*Proportion of Deaf and Dumb in the several States.*

States.	Population.	Deaf and Dumb.	Proportion.
Maine, - - -	399,455	185	1 in 2159
New Hampshire, - - -	269,328	144	1 in 1870
Massachusetts, - - -	610,408	265	1 in 2303
Rhode Island, - - -	97,199	60	1 in 1619
Connecticut, - - -	297,675	300	1 in 992
Vermont, - - -	280,652	158	1 in 1776
New-York, - - -	1,918,608	885	1 in 2167
New Jersey, - - -	320,823	222	1 in 1445
Pennsylvania, - - -	1,348,233	797	1 in 1691
Delaware, - - -	76,748	44	1 in 1744
Maryland, - - -	447,040	231	1 in 1935
Virginia, - - -	1,211,405	549	1 in 2206
North Carolina, - - -	737,987	313	1 in 2357
South Carolina, - - -	581,185	243	1 in 2391
Georgia, - - -	516,823	204	1 in 2533
Alabama, - - -	309,527	112	1 in 2763
Mississippi, - - -	136,621	41	1 in 3332
Louisiana, - - -	215,739	70	1 in 3081
Tennessee, - - -	681,904	200	1 in 3409
Kentucky, - - -	687,917	349	1 in 1971
Ohio, - - -	937,903	435	1 in 2156
Indiana, - - -	343,031	144	1 in 2382
Illinois, - - -	157,445	66	1 in 2385
Missouri, - - -	140,455	35	1 in 4013
Michigan, - - -	31,639	15	1 in 2109
Arkansas, - - -	30,388	14	1 in 2170
Florida, - - -	34,730	11	1 in 3157
District of Columbia, -	39,834	14	1 in 2845
		6106	

It is impossible to examine the above tables, without being struck with two circumstances.

1. The first is the remarkable diversity in the proportion of deaf and dumb occurring in various States. Thus, even if we exclude Connecticut, on account of her extensive asylum, and which undoubtedly increases her ratio, it still seems difficult to explain why the Northern States should have a larger proportion than the Southern, or again, why the proportion of Rhode-Island, which joins Massachusetts, should be so much greater than that of the latter State. If we examine the counties in a particular State we find, for example, that the county of Wayne, in the State of New-York, with a population of 37,788 has 41 deaf and dumb, while Ontario, an adjoining county in the same State, with a population of 40,870, has only 8.

2. The second is, the apparently rapid increase of these unfortunate beings. True, the facts on this point are not numerous, but all that we have, tend to show this. Besides the State of New-York, in which the increase during a period of ten years is strikingly shown by the facts stated above, there are several other data which I have incidentally noted and which corroborate the opinion advanced. Thus, Governor Van Ness, in his speech to the Legislature of Vermont, delivered October 10, 1823, mentioned that in 1817, a law was passed directing the Secretary of State to ascertain the number of deaf and dumb within the State, their ages and situation in life. By a report made the next year, it appeared that there were then seventy persons of that description, and that thirty-five of them were of a proper age to be admitted into an asylum for education. The number in 1830 was 158.

Again, in Pennsylvania, according to official returns made to the Governor in 1821, there were 485 deaf and dumb, while in 1828, but 468 were enumerated.\* In 1830, according to the United States census, the number was 797.

\* Hazard's Register of Pennsylvania, vol. 4. p. 380.



In the "Fourth Circular of the Royal Institute of the deaf and dumb at Paris," published in 1836, a table is given, founded on one originally prepared by Mr. Burnet, a mute, to show the relative proportion of the deaf and dumb in the white and colored population of the United States. I add some of the abstracts.

# Statistics of the Deaf and Dumb.

12

<i>Northern States, including</i> Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Isl- and, Connecticut, Vermont, New- York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, <i>Southern States.</i> Maryland, District of Columbia, Vir- ginia, North Carolina, South Car- olina, Georgia. <i>South-western States.</i> Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Tennessee, Kentucky, Missouri, Arkansas, Florida. <i>North-western States.</i> Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Total,	White popu- lation.	White deaf and dumb.	Proportion.	Colored population.	Colored deaf & dumb.	Proportion.	Total deaf & dumb.	Proportion to the whole population.
	5,474,768	2916 1	in 1877	144,361	144 1	in 1002	3060 1	in 1836
	2,040,483	1115 1	in 1830	1493,791	439 1	in 3402	1554 1	in 2274
	1,563,674	684 1	in 2284	674,607	148	in 4,558	832 1	in 2689
	1,454,135	648 1	in 2244	15,883	12 1	in 1323	660 1	in 2227
	10,532,060	5363 1	in 1964	2328,642	743 1	in 3134	6106 1	in 2106



There is one comment made by the editor of the work from which I have taken this abstract, to which I cannot too pointedly call the attention of my readers. It is the fact of the far greater prevalence of this infirmity among the free blacks than among the slave population. Thus in the ten northern States, as enumerated, the proportion is 1 in 1002, although there is scarcely a slave in these States. So also in the north-western district, the proportion is 1 in 1323. While in the southern States, where all are slaves, the proportion is 1 in 3402, and in the south-western 1 in 4558. If physical causes have the slightest effect in producing this malady, does not the above statement prove that the condition of our free blacks is infinitely worse than that of their brethren at the south?

I now proceed to state such European results as I have been enabled to procure.

#### KINGDOM OF PRUSSIA.

The number of deaf and dumb, according to a census taken in 1825, was 6786; in 1827, 6764; in 1828, 8223, in a population of 12,726,823, making a proportion of one mute to every 1548 inhabitants. A diversity similar to that which I have already stated, exists as to the numbers in the respective provinces of this kingdom. Thus, East Prussia has one deaf and dumb to every 1078 inhabitants, while Cleves-Berg has only one to every 2844. The writer who notices these facts, observes that the only circumstances which seem to have any influence in producing this diversity, are that those provinces in which knowledge is most extensively diffused and which enjoy most completely the conveniences of life, have a smaller number of deaf and dumb.\*

The following table exhibits the age of the above individuals.

\* *Troisième Circulaire de L'Institut Royal des Sourd—Muets de Paris a toutes les Institutions de Sourd—Muets de L'Europe, de l'Amerique et De l'Asie*, 8 vo. Paris, 1832. I am indebted for this and the other circulars, published respectively in 1827, 1829, 1832 and 1836, to the kindness of John A. Dix, Esq. Secretary of State.

From 1 to 5 years,	275
5 to 10 "	1118
10 to 15 "	1400
15 to 20 "	1220
20 to 25 "	1063
25 to 30 "	891
30 to 35 "	563
35 to 40 "	466
40 to 45 "	317
45 to 50 "	331
50 to 55 "	208
55 to 60 "	166
60 to 65 "	128
65 to 70 "	38
70 to 75 "	26
75 to 80 "	7
80 to 85 "	5
85 to 90 "	1
	<hr/>
	8223

*Sex.*—Of 2819 whose sexes were ascertained by the census of 1825, 1591 were males and 1228 females, being in the portion of 4 to 3.\*

#### SWITZERLAND.

From an examination made in several cantons, the following returns were obtained, probably in 1826, but I have not been able to ascertain the precise year.

	Population.	Deaf and Dumb.	Proportion.
Zürich,	220,000	225	1 in 1000
Vaud,	155,000	152	1 in 1000
Basle,	50,00	100	1 in 500
Argovia,	120,000	300	1 in 400
Berne,	350,000	1000	1 in 350
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	895,000	1777	1 in 503

\* Troisième Circulaire, p. 127.



The details of the Pays De Vaud are as follows. Out of 152, there are 66, 30 males and 36 females, capable of receiving instruction, while 70, 40 males and 30 females, are either from age or disease, or mental imbecility approaching cretenism, incapable of it. Lastly, 16, 7 males and 9 females, form an intermediate class between the two, and the prospect of instructing them is faint. The majority belong to poor families, and of 82 capable of instruction, only 26 can contribute towards its expense.\*

#### DENMARK.

In the Danish Dominions, from returns made by the clergy in 1807, the number of deaf and dumb was 515 in a population of 820,621, being one in every 1593.† According to the table in the third circular of the Paris Deaf and Dumb Institution, the number was 1260 with a population of 1,800,000—being in the proportion of 1 to 1428 and not 1714, as stated in the table and copied from thence into the last (seventh) edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica.‡ Hence there would be an increase instead of a diminution of the number, but I apprehend that this statement is merely conjectural, as I can find no authority for the number stated of the deaf and dumb. In 1834, however, a census was taken by order of the Government, of which the following are abstracts.

	Males.	Females.	Total.
Zealand, including the city of Copenhagen,	144	114	258
Diocese of Laaland and Falster,	13	12	25
Diocese of Funen,	51	46	97
Jutland, including four Dioceses,	129	121	250
	<hr/> 337	<hr/> 293	<hr/> 630

\* Troisieme Circulaire, p. 121. Bulletin des Sciences Medicales, vol. 11, p. 53. † Dr. Reeve in Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal, vol. 7, p. 60. ‡ Vol. 7, Art. Deaf and Dumb.

*Statistics of the Deaf and Dumb.*

Age.	Males.	Females.	Total.
From 1 to 8 years,	24	27	51
8 to 14 "	64	39	103
14 to 20 "	62	45	107
20 to 30 "	77	68	145
30 to 40 "	40	49	89
40 to 50 "	29	24	53
50 to 60 "	26	25	51
60 to 70 "	14	10	24
Above 70 "	1	6	7
	<hr/> 337	<hr/> 293	<hr/> 630

The directors of the Royal Institution of Copenhagen suggest, that the number in the first line, between 1 and 8 years, is hardly complete, since very frequently the fact is not sufficiently ascertained during that period, of the infirmity of the child, or at all events, that there will be an indisposition to register it. They conceive that the number should be doubled, and the total will hence be 680.

The proportion in various parts of the population is thus stated.

	Number.	Population.	Proportion.
The Capital, Copenhagen,	$62 + 5 = 67$	119,292	1 in 1780
The cities,	$65 + 5 = 70$	132,220	1 in 1889
The country,	$503 + 40 = 543$	972,295	1 in 1791
	<hr/> $630 + 50 = 680$	<hr/> 1,223,807	<hr/> 1 in 1800

If to these we add Iceland and the Faroe Islands, population 57,000 and 6,000—and the Dutchies of Schleswig, Holstein and Lauenberg, population 800,000, and allow to them deaf and Dumb in the proportion as above, of 1 to every 1800, the total for the whole Danish Dominions will be as follows.

Danish Provinces, properly so called,	680
Iceland and the Faroe Islands,	35
Dutchies of Schleswig, Holstein and Lauenberg,	450
	<hr/> 1165*

\* Quatrieme Circulaire, p. 209 to 218.



KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS.

In 1829, previous to the separation of Holland and Belgium there were in that kingdom 2166 mutes in a population of 6,166,854, being a proportion of 1 in 2847.

BELGIUM.

In 1835, a census of the deaf and dumb was taken in this kingdom, which I present in a tabular form, adding the sexes of those aged from 6 to 18 years.

PROVINCES.	Population.	Deaf & dumb.	Proportion:	Males from 6 to 18.	Females fm. 6 to 18.	Total.
Antwerp, -	358,107	102	1 to 3511	17	17	34
Brabant, -	565,353	240	1 to 2355	43	28	71
West Flanders,	609,045	281	1 to 2167	58	36	94
East Flanders,	743,232	312	1 to 2382	61	57	118
Hainault, - -	617,683	331	1 to 1866	40	47	87
Liege, - -	377,909	194	1 to 1948	27	16	43
Limburg, - -	341,880	173	1 to 1976	26	18	44
Luxemburg, -	311,113	127	1 to 2450	20	19	39
Namur, - -	217,935	140	1 to 1557	19	15	34
Total,	4,142,257	1900	1 to 2180	311	253	564

The proportion of the sexes in the whole number is eight females to ten males.\*

KINGDOM OF SAXONY.

	Population.	Deaf and Dumb.	Proportion.
July 3, 1832,	1,558,153	1168	1 in 1334

It is here also suggested that many between the ages of one and five have not been counted, and it is proposed to add one-eighth for this omission, which will be 146, and thus raise the number to 1314, and make the proportion 1 to every 1186 inhabitants.

Of the number obtained by the census, 643 are males and 525 females. The male population of Saxony is 756,554 and the female 801,599. The proportion then, of male mutes to the whole male population, is one in every 1177, and of the female, 1 in 1527. The true mode, however, of comparing the sexes in this respect, is to apply the male proportion to

\* Quatrieme Circulaire, p. 220.

the female population. This will give 681 as the number of male mutes to a male population equal to the females, and the ratio therefore will be 681 to 525, or nearly 4 males to 3 females.\*

According to Mr. Preston, another census of this kingdom was declared December 1, 1834, with the following results.

Population.	Deaf and Dumb.	Proportion.
1,595,668	1010	1 in 1579†

#### DUTCHY OF BRUNSWICK.

The following medico-statistical table of the deaf and dumb in this Dutchy, in 1836, by Dr. Mansfeld, I take from a recent number of the British and Foreign Medical Review.

1. The whole population of the Dutchy is 253,232 ; the total number of deaf and dumb 125, consequently the proportion is 1 in 2026. 2. Of the 125, 60 are males and 65 females. 3. Nearly the fourth part of the whole number had one or two brothers or sisters similarly affected. 4. For the most part, these persons belong to the middle and lower classes, their parents being generally poor. 5. The health of these persons is in general good, those residing in the vicinity of the Harz are said to be scrofulous, and five of the whole number are idiotic. In two cases only could the deaf and dumbness be traced to distinct causes, viz. one as the consequence of fright, the other of miliary fever. 6. Almost all the deaf and dumb in the Dutchy have the benefit of education, a circumstance very creditable to the country, and which the author, with a just pride, contrasts with the great neglect of the same class of persons in Austria, in which vast empire it appears that out of 20,639 individuals laboring under this infirmity, only 400 are placed in houses of instruction, 10 in number, all the rest being left without assistance. When it is considered that of this number the fifth part at least are susceptible of instruction, there is evidently here a great neglect of the duties of humanity. 7. With the exception of those who are yet too young to work or who are mentally incapable

\* Quatrieme Circulaire, p. 206. † Lond. Athenæum, No. 443, April 23, 1836.



of gaining their livelihood, or are supported by relatives, (57 in all) or who are in the course of instruction (number not mentioned,) all the others are gaining their own livelihood, as artizans and laborers. Doctor Mansfeld calls the particular attention of teachers to the fact that in many cases the inability to acquire the sound of particular letters or words depends on physical defects of the organs of speech, and not mental incapacity. In proof of this, he instances nine cases among the children at this time in the Brunswick Institution, who labor under some defect of this kind. The defects mentioned are the following: Imperfect uvula; thick tongue, without fraenum; large tongue, long and irregular uvula; tongue deficient in muscularity; tubular palate, imperfect uvula, enlarged tonsils; flat and irregular palate, general defective size of mouth, large tonsils; imperfectly developed larynx.\*

ENGLAND.†

"It has been ascertained that the number of deaf and dumb in England and Wales is not less than 8000. One in every 1750, the population being 14 millions."†

IRELAND.

"M. Mucke, Director of the Institution at Prague informs us that a census of the deaf and dumb has been taken in Ireland, and that 3500 were found in a population of 6 millions, being 1 in every 1714."‡

ITALY.

According to a government census in the Dutchy of Modena, the Commune of Modena contained 25 deaf and dumb in 50,000; Province of Reggio 72 in 142,000.

No further details have been obtained, but it is stated on the authority of M. Fabriani, that the proportion ascertained is 1 in 2000. Now as the population of the whole Dutchy is 376,000, the number of deaf and dumb is probably 188.

The city of Rome, with a population of 150,000, contains 70 deaf and dumb, 30 females and 40 males.§

\* British and Foreign Medical Review, vol. 3, p. 255, from the *Hannoversche Annalen*, October, 1836. † London Journal of Education, vol. 7, p. 193. ‡ *Troisieme Circulaire*, p. 125. § *Quatrieme Circulaire*, p. 205.

The above are all the authentic reports (with the exception of those given in the succeeding table,) that I have been enabled to obtain. It does not appear that a census has yet been taken in France or in the Austrian empire. To supply these deficiencies, and at the same time to form some estimate as to the probable number of the deaf and dumb, the editors of the "Troisieme Circulaire" constructed a table of such as were then (1832,) ascertained and took the average and applied it to the population of various countries, and finally to the whole world. This table is as follows.

Countries.	Population.	Deaf & dumb.	Proportion.
Switzerland,	895,000	1,777	1 in 503
Grand Duchy of Baden,	1,108,060	1,983	1 in 559
Wurtemberg,	1,550,215	1,250	1 in 1240
Bavaria,	4,037,000	2,908	1 in 1388
Prussia,	12,726,823	8,223	1 in 1548
Electorate of Hesse,	550,000	400	1 in 1375
Duchy of Nassau,	300,000	210	1 in 1428
Duchy of Brunswick,	206,000	176	1 in 1170
Netherlands,	6,166,854	2,166	1 in 2847
Denmark,	1,800,000	1,260	1 in 1428*
Ireland,	6,000,000	3,500	1 in 1714
United States,	12,000,000	6,000	1 in 2000
	47,339,952	29,853	1 in 1585

The average number (1585) is now taken and applied to those countries in which no census of the deaf and dumb had been taken, and a second table being thus formed, and the whole again compared, it appeared that Europe, with a population of 214 millions probably contained 139,212 deaf and dumb.† It is not necessary to copy this table after the foregoing explanation. It may be found in full in the Encyclopedia Britannica, as already quoted.

I will now subjoin a table of those countries which I have mentioned in the former part of this paper, for the purpose of establishing a comparison between it and the one just given. The object of course, is to ascertain if possible, whether the

\*Corrected as stated in a previous page. †Troisieme Circulaire, p. 126.  
162.



proportion of deaf and dumb has on the whole during the last few years, increased, diminished, or remained stationary.

Countries.	Population.	Deaf & dumb.	Proportion.
New-York, 1835,	2,174,517	1070	1 in 2032
Denmark, 1834,	1,223,807	680	1 in 1800
Belgium, 1835,	4,142,257	1900	1 in 2180
Saxony, 1834,	1,595,668	1010	1 in 1579
Brunswick, 1836,†	253,232	125	1 in 2026
	9,389,481	4785	1 in 1962

At first sight, the result may seem to shew a diminution in the number, in proportion to the population; but it must be recollected that the countries examined, contain in all less than ten millions—that they are generally healthy countries, and that some states, as Switzerland, where the number of deaf and dumb is unusually great, do not enter into the elements of calculation. If these points be considered, we shall I think, be willing to allow that the former average (1 in 1500) is probably the nearest to exactness.

As to the question of increase, in particular countries, it would certainly seem from most of the data now given, to be decided in the affirmative.

*Sex.* We have but few facts on this point. The following is given in the French treatise already referred to.

	Deaf & Dumb.	Males.	Females.	Proportion.
Canton of Zurich,	206	111	95	7 to 6
Prussia, - -	2819	1591	1228	4 to 3
Denmark, - - -	607	325	282	8 to 7
State of N. Y. (1825)	569	289	280	32 to 31
	4201	2316	1885	6 to 5

We may add to this,				
State of New-York, 1835, -	719	342	377	19 to 21
Dutchy of Brunswick, 1836,	125	60	65	12 to 13
Denmark, 1834, . - - -	630	337	293	7 to 6
Belgium, 1835, - - - -	564	311	253	6 to 5*
Saxony, 1832, - - - - -	1168	643	525	6 to 5*
	3206	1693	1513	6 to 5

\*Nearly.

ART. XIII. STATISTICS of the BLIND in the UNITED STATES, as ascertained by the Census of 1830, by T. ROMEYN BECK, M. D.

(Communicated by the Author.)

States, &c.	Whites.	Slaves and colored persons.	Total.
Maine,	159	1	160
New-Hampshire,	105	...	105
Massachusetts,	218	5	223
Rhode Island,	56	8	64
Connecticut,	188	7	195
Vermont,	51	..	51
New-York,	642	82	724
New Jersey,	205	22	227
Pennsylvania,	475	28	503
Delaware,	18	11	29
Maryland,	147	124	271
Virginia,	355	438	793
North Carolina,	223	161	384
South Carolina,	102	136	238
Georgia,	150	123	273
Alabama,	68	48	116
Mississippi,	25	31	56
Louisiana,	36	77	113
Tennessee,	176	37	213
Kentucky,	169	83	252
Ohio,	232	6	238
Indiana,	85	2	87
Illinois,	35	4	39
Missouri,	27	10	37
Michigan,	5	...	5
Arkansas,	8	2	10
Florida,	3	16	19
District of Columbia,	11	8	19
	3974	1470	5444

Proportion, 1 in 2363.



A still later investigation on this subject has been made under the authority of the Legislature of Ohio, and it appears that in 1836, there were no less than 287 blind, in 59 counties of that state, ; 160 males and 127 females. Of this number 60 were under sixteen years of age, and 29 from 16 to 25\*.

The following exhibits the number of blind in the kingdom of Saxony, at two different periods.†

	Population.	Blind.	Proportion.
July 3, 1832,	1,558.123	423	1 in 3675
December 1, 1834,	1,595.668	324	1 in 4924

\*Boston Medical and Surgical Journal, vol. 16, p. 35, (Feb. 15, 1837.)  
In the United States census for 1830, 73 counties are enumerated in Ohio.

†London Athenæum, April 23, 1836.

---

N. B. After every effort to render the figures in the preceding pages accurate, I find one or two errors have crept in. Page 328. Montgomery county, 1825, insert 1 in the column of males under 10.

Saratoga county, 1825, the total is 13 and not 14.

Schoharie county, 1825, the total is 14 and not 13.

A full list of the names of the persons who have been  
 admitted to the office of the Secretary of the  
 Board of Education, from the year 1857 to the  
 present time, is given in the following table.  
 The names are arranged in alphabetical order, and  
 the dates of admission are given in the second  
 column.

NAME	DATE
John A. Smith	1857
James B. Jones	1858
William C. Brown	1859
Thomas D. White	1860
Charles E. Green	1861
Frederick F. Black	1862
George G. Gray	1863
Henry H. Hall	1864
Isaac I. Hill	1865
John J. Hunt	1866
William K. King	1867
Thomas L. Lee	1868
Charles M. Martin	1869
Frederick N. Nash	1870
George O. Oliver	1871
Henry P. Parker	1872
Isaac Q. Quinn	1873
John R. Reed	1874
William S. Shaw	1875
Thomas T. Taylor	1876
Charles U. Underhill	1877
Frederick V. Vance	1878
George W. Walker	1879
Henry X. West	1880
Isaac Y. Young	1881
John Z. Zimmerman	1882
William A. Adams	1883
Thomas B. Baker	1884
Charles C. Campbell	1885
Frederick D. Davis	1886
George E. Edwards	1887
Henry F. Fisher	1888
Isaac G. Gibson	1889
John H. Harris	1890
William I. Ingram	1891
Thomas J. Jackson	1892
Charles K. Keith	1893
Frederick L. Lewis	1894
George M. Mack	1895
Henry N. Neal	1896
Isaac O. Olsen	1897
John P. Peterson	1898
William Q. Quinn	1899
Thomas R. Reed	1900
Charles S. Shaw	1901
Frederick T. Taylor	1902
George U. Underhill	1903
Henry V. Vance	1904
Isaac W. Walker	1905
John X. West	1906
William Y. Young	1907
Thomas Z. Zimmerman	1908
Charles A. Adams	1909
Frederick B. Baker	1910
George C. Campbell	1911
Henry D. Davis	1912
Isaac E. Edwards	1913
John F. Fisher	1914
William G. Gibson	1915
Thomas H. Harris	1916
Charles I. Ingram	1917
Frederick J. Jackson	1918
George K. Keith	1919
Henry L. Lewis	1920
Isaac M. Mack	1921
John N. Neal	1922
William O. Olsen	1923
Thomas P. Peterson	1924
Charles Q. Quinn	1925
Frederick R. Reed	1926
George S. Shaw	1927
Henry T. Taylor	1928
Isaac U. Underhill	1929
John V. Vance	1930
William W. Walker	1931
Thomas X. West	1932
Charles Y. Young	1933
Frederick Z. Zimmerman	1934
George A. Adams	1935
Henry B. Baker	1936
Isaac C. Campbell	1937
John D. Davis	1938
William E. Edwards	1939
Thomas F. Fisher	1940
Charles G. Gibson	1941
Frederick H. Harris	1942
George I. Ingram	1943
Henry J. Jackson	1944
Isaac K. Keith	1945
John L. Lewis	1946
William M. Mack	1947
Thomas N. Neal	1948
Charles O. Olsen	1949
Frederick P. Peterson	1950
George Q. Quinn	1951
Henry R. Reed	1952
Isaac S. Shaw	1953
John T. Taylor	1954
William U. Underhill	1955
Thomas V. Vance	1956
Charles W. Walker	1957
Frederick X. West	1958
George Y. Young	1959
Henry Z. Zimmerman	1960
Isaac A. Adams	1961
John B. Baker	1962
William C. Campbell	1963
Thomas D. Davis	1964
Charles E. Edwards	1965
Frederick F. Fisher	1966
George G. Gibson	1967
Henry H. Harris	1968
Isaac I. Ingram	1969
John J. Jackson	1970
William K. Keith	1971
Thomas L. Lewis	1972
Charles M. Mack	1973
Frederick N. Neal	1974
George O. Olsen	1975
Henry P. Peterson	1976
Isaac Q. Quinn	1977
John R. Reed	1978
William S. Shaw	1979
Thomas T. Taylor	1980
Charles U. Underhill	1981
Frederick V. Vance	1982
George W. Walker	1983
Henry X. West	1984
Isaac Y. Young	1985
John Z. Zimmerman	1986
William A. Adams	1987
Thomas B. Baker	1988
Charles C. Campbell	1989
Frederick D. Davis	1990
George E. Edwards	1991
Henry F. Fisher	1992
Isaac G. Gibson	1993
John H. Harris	1994
William I. Ingram	1995
Thomas J. Jackson	1996
Charles K. Keith	1997
Frederick L. Lewis	1998
George M. Mack	1999
Henry N. Neal	2000
Isaac O. Olsen	2001
John P. Peterson	2002
William Q. Quinn	2003
Thomas R. Reed	2004
Charles S. Shaw	2005
Frederick T. Taylor	2006
George U. Underhill	2007
Henry V. Vance	2008
Isaac W. Walker	2009
John X. West	2010
William Y. Young	2011
Thomas Z. Zimmerman	2012
Charles A. Adams	2013
Frederick B. Baker	2014
George C. Campbell	2015
Henry D. Davis	2016
Isaac E. Edwards	2017
John F. Fisher	2018
William G. Gibson	2019
Thomas H. Harris	2020
Charles I. Ingram	2021
Frederick J. Jackson	2022
George K. Keith	2023
Henry L. Lewis	2024
Isaac M. Mack	2025
John N. Neal	2026
William O. Olsen	2027
Thomas P. Peterson	2028
Charles Q. Quinn	2029
Frederick R. Reed	2030
George S. Shaw	2031
Henry T. Taylor	2032
Isaac U. Underhill	2033
John V. Vance	2034
William W. Walker	2035
Thomas X. West	2036
Charles Y. Young	2037
Frederick Z. Zimmerman	2038
George A. Adams	2039
Henry B. Baker	2040
Isaac C. Campbell	2041
John D. Davis	2042
William E. Edwards	2043
Thomas F. Fisher	2044
Charles G. Gibson	2045
Frederick H. Harris	2046
George I. Ingram	2047
Henry J. Jackson	2048
Isaac K. Keith	2049
John L. Lewis	2050
William M. Mack	2051
Thomas N. Neal	2052
Charles O. Olsen	2053
Frederick P. Peterson	2054
George Q. Quinn	2055
Henry R. Reed	2056
Isaac S. Shaw	2057
John T. Taylor	2058
William U. Underhill	2059
Thomas V. Vance	2060
Charles W. Walker	2061
Frederick X. West	2062
George Y. Young	2063
Henry Z. Zimmerman	2064
Isaac A. Adams	2065
John B. Baker	2066
William C. Campbell	2067
Thomas D. Davis	2068
Charles E. Edwards	2069
Frederick F. Fisher	2070
George G. Gibson	2071
Henry H. Harris	2072
Isaac I. Ingram	2073
John J. Jackson	2074
William K. Keith	2075
Thomas L. Lewis	2076
Charles M. Mack	2077
Frederick N. Neal	2078
George O. Olsen	2079
Henry P. Peterson	2080
Isaac Q. Quinn	2081
John R. Reed	2082
William S. Shaw	2083
Thomas T. Taylor	2084
Charles U. Underhill	2085
Frederick V. Vance	2086
George W. Walker	2087
Henry X. West	2088
Isaac Y. Young	2089
John Z. Zimmerman	2090
William A. Adams	2091
Thomas B. Baker	2092
Charles C. Campbell	2093
Frederick D. Davis	2094
George E. Edwards	2095
Henry F. Fisher	2096
Isaac G. Gibson	2097
John H. Harris	2098
William I. Ingram	2099
Thomas J. Jackson	2100

The names of the persons who have been  
 admitted to the office of the Secretary of the  
 Board of Education, from the year 1857 to the  
 present time, are given in the following table.  
 The names are arranged in alphabetical order, and  
 the dates of admission are given in the second  
 column.

The names of the persons who have been  
 admitted to the office of the Secretary of the  
 Board of Education, from the year 1857 to the  
 present time, are given in the following table.  
 The names are arranged in alphabetical order, and  
 the dates of admission are given in the second  
 column.